

### **REMARKS:**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 29, 2009. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. By the present amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application with claim 1 being in independent form.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**


Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. It is stated that it is unclear if “the first row” in line 16 of claim 1 is that of the first group or of the second group. Claim 1 has been amended in a manner believed to obviate the rejection.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Moresco (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,756) (hereinafter “Moresco”). Claim 1 is amended to recite “a fourth row disposed on an inner position relative to the third row, and a fourth column that is perpendicular to the fourth row and disposed on an inner position relative to the third column.” Support for the recited features of claim 1 is shown in Figures 6, 8, 9A-9C, 10A-10D, 11A-11D and 12A-12D, for example, and the relevant portions of the specification.

The Examiner states that the first group is considered as the white squares and the second group is considered as the black squares on an inner position in Moresco’s annotated Figure 14 “+ shape (plus).” Applicant disagrees and submits that the white squares and the black squares do not correspond to the first group and the second group respectively, which are recited with all

other features and structures in claim 1. Even if the white squares and the black squares are considered as the first group and the second group respectively, Moresco does not teach the fourth row and the fourth column of second group, which is arranged parallel to an outer periphery of the semiconductor member. See Annotated Figure 14 of Moresco below:



Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Moresco. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 1, 2 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Moresco in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"). AAPA does not cure the deficiency of Moresco mentioned above. Claim 3 depends on claim 1 and, therefore, claim 3 is patentable over Moresco and AAPA for at least the same reason as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, claims 1-11, are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Katherine R. Vieyra/

Katherine R. Vieyra  
Registration No.: 47,155

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

KRV:NT:ae